

# **EXHIBIT 6**

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
3 ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

4 ROSY GIRON DE REYES, )  
5 et al, )  
6 Plaintiffs, ) Civil 16-563  
7 v. )  
8 WAPLES MOBILE HOME PARK ) Alexandria, Virginia  
9 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ) September 23, 2020  
et al, )  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

10 TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING  
11 VIA ZOOM

12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE T. S. ELLIS  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14  
15 APPEARANCES:

16 For the Plaintiffs: Simon Yehuda Sandoval-Moshenberg  
17 Gianna Puccinelli  
18 Nady Peralta  
Matthew Traupman

19 For the Defendants: Michael Sterling Dingman  
20 Grayson Hanes  
21 Justin deBettencourt  
Grayson Hanes

22 Court Reporter: PATRICIA A. KANESHIRO-MILLER, RMR, CRR  
23

24 Proceedings reported by stenotype shorthand.  
25 Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 plaintiffs have shown that through evidence produced by  
2 defendants themselves and through the testimony of their  
3 expert, Professor Clark.

4 And as a quick note, Your Honor may have seen that  
5 defendants filed a *Daubert* motion on Professor Clark,  
6 implicitly acknowledging that those issues are more  
7 appropriately resolved, not in the context of summary  
8 judgment, but in the context of pretrial motions like the one  
9 that they filed.

10 THE COURT: Yes, I understand all of that. But what  
11 I was asking you, Ms. Puccinelli, is: What, if any, goal  
12 does the anti-harboring statute play in the analysis of  
13 plaintiffs' disparate impact claim?

14 MS. PUCCINELLI: Your Honor, plaintiffs believe that  
15 the defendants appropriately argued that issue in the context  
16 of step two of the argument. While we obviously disagree  
17 that that is an interest that satisfies step two, we  
18 acknowledge that there is a dispute of fact as to that point,  
19 and it is appropriately relegated to the step two analysis.

20 THE COURT: And what is the factual issue that you  
21 think is presented for the jury to decide involving the  
22 anti-harboring statute?

23 MS. PUCCINELLI: Well, Your Honor, the primary issue  
24 is that plaintiffs believe that defendants have not shown  
25 that the anti-harboring statute actually applied to them, nor